



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/776,383	02/11/2004	Shaker Mousa	MOUSA-6043	3915
7590 02/02/2009 JACK P. FRIEDMAN, Ph.D. Schmeiser, Olsen & Watts 22 Century Hill Drive Suite 302 Latham, NY 12110				
EXAMINER KWON, BRIAN YONG S				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
1614				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
02/02/2009		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/776,383

Applicant(s)

MOUSA ET AL.

Examiner

Brian-Yong S. Kwon

Art Unit

1614

Period for Reply -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 November 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 31-63 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 35-38, 42-60, 62 and 63 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 31-34, 39-41 and 61 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. Applicants' election of Group II along with "nicotine or polymeric form thereof" and "growth factor", namely "vascular endothelial growth factor (VEFG), as the elected species is acknowledged.

The election was made with traverse. The traversal is on the ground that the three species of species e), f), and g) are not mutually exclusive. The applicant's argument is not found to be persuasive as species recited in claim 41 is not necessarily included in claim 43-45 and 48 (as well as new claims 62-63). Furthermore, there would be serious search and examination burden if restriction were not required because the inventions require a different field of search (for example, searching different classes/subclasses or electronic resources, or employing different search queries) and the prior art applicable to one invention or species would not likely be applicable to another invention since search of growth factor does not necessarily reveal the subject matter of vasodilator or anticoagulant. Thus, the restriction and/or election of species is/are still deemed proper and made final.

It is noted that upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which depend from or otherwise require all the limitations of an allowable generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141.

2. A telephone call was made to Mr. Jack P. Friedman on January 21 and January 23, 2009 to discuss applicant's oversight in making a complete response to the supplemental election of species requirement mailed 10/21/2008. Acknowledgement is made of applicant's election of nicotinic acid analog conjugated to polyvinyl alcohol via ester linkage.

Art Unit: 1614

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include an election of the invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143).

Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

3. Claims 31-34, 39-41 and 61 read on the elected species. Claims 35-38, 42-60 and 62-63 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to a nonelected group or species, there being no allowable generic or linking claim.

Priority

4. According to the Bib Data Sheet of the instant application, this application claims benefit of US Provisional Application No. 60/446568 filed 02/12/2003. While the nicotinic acid analog or polymeric forms where nicotinic acid is conjugated to polyvinyl alcohol, acrylic acid ethylene co-polymer or polylactic acid, or incorporated or encapsulated in a polymer is disclosed, the conjugation with polyethyleneglycol (PEG) was not disclosed in the provisional application. Therefore, the subject matter related to polyethyleneglycol is not entitled to the earlier filing date of 02/12/2003.

Art Unit: 1614

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

5. Claims 31, 39-41 and 61 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claims contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventors, at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. This is a written description rejection, rather than an enablement rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph. Applicant is directed to the Guidelines for the Examination of Patent Applications Under the 35 U.S.C. 112, 1st "Written Description" Requirement, Federal Register, Vol. 66, No. 4, pages 1099-1111, Friday January 5, 2001.

The specification discloses nicotinic acid or nicotinic acid analog where said nicotinic acid is conjugated to polyvinyl alcohol, acrylic acid ethylene co-polymer, polyethyleneglycol (PEG) or polylactic acid, which meet the written description and enablement provisions of 35 USC 112, first paragraph. However, the claims 31, 36-41 and 61 are directed to encompass "analogs" or "a polymeric form" which only correspond in some undefined way to specifically instantly disclosed chemicals. None of these meet the written description provision of 35 USC 112, first paragraph, due to lacking chemical structural information for what they are and chemical structures are highly variant and encompasses a myriad of possibilities. To the extent that no structure function data is disclosed in connection with theses functionally described compounds to correlate, or there is not disclosed correlation established between these functional drugs

Art Unit: 1614

and the contemplated desired therapeutic effect to be achieved in practicing the instant invention, the specification provides insufficient written description to support the genus encompassed by the claims.

Vas-Cath Inc. Mahurkar, 19 USPQ2d 1111, makes clear the “applicant must convey with reasonable clarity to those skilled in the art that, as of the filing date sought, he or she was in possession of the invention. The invention is, for purposes of the ‘written description’ inquiry, whatever is now claimed.” (See page 1117.) The specification does not “clearly allow persons of ordinary skill in the art to recognize that [he or she] invented what is claimed.” (See Vas-Cath at page 1116).

With the exception of nicotinic acid or nicotinic acid analog where the nicotinic acid is conjugated to polyvinyl alcohol, acrylic acid ethylene co-polymer, polyethyleneglycol (PEG) or polylactic acid, the skilled artisan cannot envision the detailed chemical structure of the encompassed derivatives, analogs, etc., regardless of the complexity or simplicity of the method of isolation. Adequate written description requires more than a mere statement that it is part of the invention and reference to a potential method for isolating it. See Fiers v. Revel, 25 USPQ2d 1601, 1606 (CAFC 1993) and Amgen Inc. V. Chugai pharmaceutical Co. Ltd., 18 USPQ2d 1016. In Fiddes v. Baird, 30 USPQ2d 1481, 1483, claims directed to mammalian FGF’s were found unpatentable due to lack of written description for the broad class. The specification provided only the bovine sequence.

Finally, University of California v. Eli Lilly and Co., 43 USPQ2d 1398, 1404, 1405 held that:...To fulfill the written description requirement, a patent specification must describe an invention and do so in sufficient detail that one skilled in the art can

Art Unit: 1614

clearly conclude that “the inventor invented the claimed invention.” *Lockwood v. American Airlines, Inc.*, 107 F.3d 1565, 1572, 41 USPQ2d 1961, 1966(1997); *In re Gosteli*, 872 F.2d 1008, 1012, 10 USPQ2d 1614, 1618 (Fed. Cir. 1989) (“[T]he description must clearly allow persons of ordinary skill in the art to recognize that [the inventor] invented what is claimed.”) Thus, an applicant complies with the written description requirement “by describing the invention, with all its claimed limitations, not that which makes it obvious,” and by using “such descriptive means as words, structures, figures, diagrams, formulas, etc., that set forth the claimed invention.” *Lockwood*, 107 F.3d at 1572, 41 USPQ2d at 1966.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

6. Claims 31-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by FR 7037 (ROUSSEL-UCLAF).

FR 7037 teaches a composition comprising a nicotinic acid analog such as polyvinyl nicotinate where the nicotinic acid is linked to polyvinyl alcohol via esterification that is useful as an agent having peripheral vasodilatory action (abstract).

Although FR 7037 is silent about the functional characteristic of said compound or composition in promoting angiogenesis, such characteristic seems to be inherent to the referenced composition. Since the instant invention is directed to a composition, a

Art Unit: 1614

statement of functional property or characteristic of said compound or composition does not have a patentable weight. In accordance with the patent statutes, an article or composition of matter, in order to be patentable, must not only be useful and involve invention, but must also be new. If there is no novelty in an article or composition itself, then a patent cannot be properly granted on the article or composition, regardless of the use for which it is intended. The difficulty is not that there can never be invention in discovering a new process involving the use of an old article, but that the statutes make no provision for patenting of an article or composition which is not, in and of itself, new.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the

Art Unit: 1614

various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

7. Claims 31-34, 39-41 and 61 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over FR 7037 (ROUSSEL-UCLAF) in view of Grover et al. (Pediatr Res., 2002, Dec.; 52(6):907-12).

The teaching of FR 7037 has been discussed in above 35 USC 102(b) rejection.

Grover teaches a use of growth factor such as vascular endothelial growth factor as an agent having peripheral vasodilatory activity.

The teaching of FR 7037 differs from the claimed invention in the use of growth factor, namely vascular endothelial growth factor.

To incorporate such teaching into the teaching of FR 7037, would have been obvious in view of Grover who teaches the use of vascular endothelial growth factor as a vasodilating agent.

Above references in combination make clear that polyvinylNicotinate and a vascular endothelial growth factor have been individually used as a peripheral vasodilating agent. It is obvious to combine two compositions each of which is taught by prior art to be useful for same purpose; idea of combining them flows logically from their having been individually taught in the prior art. The combination of active ingredient

Art Unit: 1614

with the same character is merely the additive effect of each individual component. *See In re Kerkhoven, 205 USPQ 1069 (CCPA 1980).*

Conclusion

8. No Claim is allowed.
9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Brian Kwon whose telephone number is (571) 272-0581. The examiner can normally be reached Tuesday through Friday from 9:00 am to 7:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ardin Marschel, can be reached on (571) 272-0718. The fax number for this Group is (571) 273-8300.

Any inquiry of a general nature of relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (571) 272-1600.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications may be obtained from Private PAIR only. For more information about PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov> Should you have any questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll free).

/Brian-Yong S Kwon/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1614

